



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,609	08/15/2001	Stephen John Lee	BE7344PCT	9900

22203 7590 04/16/2003

MARK KUSNER COMPANY LPA  
HIGHLAND PLACE SUITE 310  
6151 WILSON MILLS ROAD  
HIGHLAND-HEIGHTS, OH 44143

EXAMINER

KASTLER, SCOTT R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1742

13

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/856,609

Applicant(s)

LEE, STEPHEN JOHN

Examiner

Scott Kastler

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4-9-2003 has been entered.

***Double Patenting***

Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claims 8 and 9 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). The above claims 8 and 9 claim substantially the identical subject matter as independent apparatus claim 1 because, with respect to claim 8, Absent any specific showing that the method of construction materially affects the operation of an apparatus, the method of manufacture or use of an apparatus (how the element 12 is formed) cannot be relied upon to fairly further limit claims to the apparatus itself. In the instant case, the manner in which the element 12 is formed does not appear to materially affect the structure of the instantly claimed apparatus. With respect to claim 9, since no further "intended purpose" is recited in this claim which would affect the scope of claim 9 with respect to independent claim 1, the intended purpose to which the refractory device could be finished to

Art Unit: 1742

form would include all of the purposes of independent claim 9, rendering the scope of claim 9 substantially identical to claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hind. Hind teaches, in the embodiment of figure 2 for example, a refractory device for the teeming of molten metal including a ceramic pouring tube (25) within a metallic can (16, 17) which further encapsulates an additional ceramic supporting element (14), and a ceramic mortar, or paste which is frittable(15) in an interface zone between the pouring tube element (25) and the support element (14), where the mortar (15) is not exposed to the molten metal poured through the pouring tube element (25), is to some extent deformable at elevated temperatures (above 700 degrees C) and is structurally solid at lower temperatures (below 700 degrees C) thereby meeting the broad definition of a pyroplastic ceramic material, and where the support element (14) is fully encapsulated within the metallic can (16, 17) where the profiles of each of the elements provide corresponding interfaces, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims.

Art Unit: 1742

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind in view of EP'164. As applied to claim 1 above, Hind shows all aspects of the above claims except the specific recitation that the mortar (15) is a pyroplastic ceramic material, although as stated above, the mortar of King does meet the broad definition of a pyroplastic ceramic material. EP'164 teaches that pyroplastic ceramic materials (11) for use as refractory mortars for the purpose of sealing gaps between refractory components in a molten metal teeming arrangement is well known in the molten metal dispensing arts. Because Hind broadly requires a refractory sealing material (15) for sealing gaps between refractory components in a molten metal dispensing device, and EP'164 teaches an improved sealing material for the sealing of gaps between refractory components in a molten metal dispensing device, motivation to employ the improved sealing composition of EP'164 as the required refractory sealing material (15) of Hind, would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see Paper No 12, filed 4-9-2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-9 under 35 USC 102(b) and 103 over King or King in view of EP'164 have been fully

Art Unit: 1742


considered and are persuasive since King does not fairly show or suggest the newly added limitation of isolating the refractory mortar (49) from the molten metal to be poured. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hind or Hind in view of EP' 164, as described above.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (703) 308-2506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703) 308-3050. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.



Scott Kastler  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1742

sk  
April 15, 2003